Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/944,328	ELLIOTT, BRIG BARNUM
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jeremiah Avery	2131
All Participants: Status of Application: Allowed		
(1) <u>Jeremiah Avery</u> .	(3)	
(2) Edward A. Gordon, Esq. Reg. No. 54,130.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 19 July 2007	Time:	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: 35 U.S.C. 101, 112, 1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph and 102(e) rejections.		
Claims discussed: 1, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19 and 33.		
Prior art documents discussed: United States Patent No. 6,233,075 to Chang et al.		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.		
<ul> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summar</li> </ul>	e examiner will provide a writte record of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
Jecenil Grezy		
(Applican (Applican	t/Applicant's Representative Si	gnature – if appropriate)

4

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Mr. Gordon and the Examiner discussed correction of a punctuation error found within claim 33, as well as clarification of terminology "bases" and "basis" as well as the usage of a "setup message" within the claimed invention. Mr. Gordon authorized the correction of said punctuation error. If there was any need for further clarification, the Examiner was encouraged to contact Mr. Gordon regarding any such matters..